A History of the Department of History

William M. Dabney

The First Quarter Century

There was instruction in history at the University of New Mexico before there was a university except in name. The University was established in 1889 and began operations in 1892, but in the first few years the name was rather too grandiose for the reality. It was supposed to be the capstone of the system of public education for the territory, but there was no such system in 1892, so there were no courses of college level at the University. For the first few years the University consisted of a normal school to train teachers for the territorial schools and a preparatory school to groom young people "for admission to any college in America." In the second year there was set into operation a commercial school and a school of pharmacy to prepare students to pass the examination of the territorial Pharmacy Board.

Indeed, for two years in the mid 1890s there was a need to offer work at an even lower level than high school, so a sub-preparatory department was created, a middle school in the parlance of today. Parents of prospective students were notified of the excellent opportunity open to their youngsters, to receive instruction in "arithmetic, written and mental, language, history and geography of the United States, reading and spelling, and nature studies," all of them "taught by college professors." But still no college courses were offered, because, as the catalog announced, the University was "not yet fully equipped with professors and appliances."

The first history professor was Martha L Taylor, who had an AB from Oberlin and an AM from The Kidder Institute in 1887. For the salary of $100 a month Professor Taylor, one of five faculty members, taught geography, English grammar and literature, and history.

Although there was no instruction at the college level, history was taken seriously. The catalog contains the following information:

> The impression received on reading the course of study of the Normal Department may be that a great deal of time is given to the study of history. But since teachers, above all others, should have a knowledge of the deeds of men and the evolution of government, in order to direct aright the minds that are to control the destinies of nations, it is thought that six terms are not too much.... The plan of teaching pursued is the "Seminary Method." The geography of the countries, the biographies of great men, and the growth and development of nations in various directions are studied. Essays on historical subjects are written, the teacher furnishing only sufficient data to enable the pupil to work out the subject in the library. By consulting eminent authors, the student becomes acquainted with books and the opinions of reliable historians. Such a method requires

more time than that of committing to memory the facts arranged in a text book. To aid the student in his research, valuable historical works are continually being added to the University library.

The University library at this time contained about a thousand volumes. Since the student body numbered about 75, they could presumably be accommodated in their research projects.

The year 1897 was an important line of demarcation for the infant University. In that year the first president, Elias Stover, was succeeded by Clarence L Herrick, PhD, a scholar learned in both geology and psychology. Stover, who had been on the five-man Board of Regents while also serving in the presidency, would continue on the Board until 1912. Herrick, who had come to the territory for his health, would remain president for five years, when ill health compelled him to resign. He was succeeded by his protégé, William George Tight.

By l897 both the Pharmacy School and the Sub-Preparatory School had served their purposes and were discontinued. The Preparatory School lasted until 1919. But in the fall semester of 1897 the college opened with five students enrolled, four freshmen and one sophomore. From this modest start enrollment in the college gradually came to account for a greater proportion of the student body.

The college department as it was first set up had two curricula, the classical and the scientific. Freshmen in the classical program took History of the English Constitution; those in the scientific had a choice between this and a science such as chemistry or physics. In the sophomore year the classical student took American constitutional history; the scientific chose between this and English. (At this time "American constitutional history" signified something quite different from a course with that title today. It meant United States history since 1789—the era of government under the Constitution. It was, therefore, the second part of the survey, the first being the colonial and revolutionary era.) It is interesting to observe that neither ancient nor medieval history was offered at the college level. These were prerequisites to admission to the college and therefore offered in the Preparatory School.

In the junior and senior years the courses were elective. There were three groups: science, language, and philosophical, leading to the degrees of BS, BA, and PhD respectively. A student was required to select at least one course from each group every semester. History was in the philosophical group, as were psychology, logic, calculus, mechanics, philosophy, economics, sociology, and pedagogic research. The history choices were rather limited: the French Revolution, the Reformation, the Growth of Nations, and the History of Civilization.

Professor Martha Taylor left the University in 1899, and over the next six years history was taught by several instructors in turn, none of whom stayed on the faculty more than a year or two, and all of whom had other responsibilities besides history. There were Catherine Fields (English and history), Belle Porter (German and history), and Julia

Brown, who also was librarian. Each of these received an $800 salary and apparently did not work during the summer session.

During these years both presidents of the University, Clarence Herrick and William G. Tight, were scientists, and it was in the sciences rather than the liberal arts that significant progress was being made. There were a few faculty members in the sciences who in time became distinguished scholars in their fields. This was particularly true of John Weinzirl, a University of Wisconsin graduate who came to New Mexico in Herrick's time and had already made quite a name for himself before he left in 1907 and became a celebrated bacteriologist. History fared less well in the opening years of the twentieth century.

In 1906 the chair of history was filled by Professor Dan Richards, whose bachelor degree was from Oberlin College in 1876. This date suggests that by the time he arrived at the University he must have been in his fifties and by a wide margin the oldest member of the faculty. Richards had served as a school principal in Iowa, superintendent of schools in Gallup for eight years, and faculty member at the New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts in Las Cruces for five. Richards' salary, like that of most of the faculty, was $1200 a year. For that he taught all the history which was offered, at both the preparatory and the college level, as well as geography, economics, money and banking, and logic. Also in one semester his name appears on the books as instructor in physiology. He, along with all of the other faculty members, attended the assembly of all students three times a week, and he had various committee and administrative duties as well. He was principal of the Preparatory School during most of his tenure.

Professor Richards' teaching load can be appreciated by considering his schedule of classes for the first semester of 1906:

9:50 am	Physical Geography
10:40	Logic (Tues, Wed, Thurs)
11:30	Economics (Mon, Wed, Fri)
1:30 pm	Medieval History (four days a week)
2:20	English History (Mon, Wed, Thurs, Fri)
3:10	Greek History

Professor Richards' Teaching Schedule, Fall 1906

Until 1908 Richards' rank, like that of almost the entire faculty, was professor, but in this year it was changed to associate professor. The same thing happened to several other faculty members, like John Clark, the chemistry professor. This did not signify a demotion, but rather that President Tight decided to introduce the ranks of instructor and assistant and associate professor.

In 1909 there was an interesting addition to the history courses which could be selected by the students: History of New Mexico. It was described in the catalog thus:

> A detailed study of the history of New Mexico, including research work regarding the pueblos and Indian tribes, the earliest explorers, missions, settlements, etc. Written reports will be required on assigned topics and notes on lectures.

This new course suggests that there was a new interest in the southwestern culture, and it is about this same time that Dr. Tight set out to convert to a distinctive pattern of architecture for the University buildings. It is interesting also that somewhat more attention was being paid in the town of Albuquerque to its University on the east mesa. A physician whose office was on West Gold Street, Dr. W. G. Hope, started an annual practice of awarding prizes to University students for achievement in American history.

The contract of President Tight was not renewed in 1909, and the presidency of the University passed to Dr. Edward Dundas McQueen Gray, an erudite Scotsman who had come to the American southwest in 1893 for his health and had been serving as an Episcopal missionary in the Pecos valley before his election as president of the University.

There were several reasons why Tight was discharged, and one was his introduction of the modified pueblo style of the campus. Though admired by some, it was derided by many who thought that it was unsuitable for such a purpose. The main reason that was given for Tight's replacement was that he did not teach. The salary paid him, $2000 when he first arrived and $2500 in his last year was considered to be an amount the University could ill afford for one who was an administrator only. Gray was employed for $2400, and he also taught and served as dean of the college.

At the time of Gray's accession there were three PhDs, including himself, on the faculty. The new president set out to encourage others to take advanced work and earn their doctorates. At this time and for many years thereafter there was no sabbatical policy at all, and the most that could be granted to a faculty member who wished to pursue graduate work was a leave without pay, his salary to be used to pay someone else to teach his courses. Professor Dan Richards had only a bachelor's degree, and one year after Gray's arrival, he was gone from the faculty. Gray himself took over the position of professor of history.

Gray was not well liked. There was faculty resentment of the firing of Tight, and sympathy for the ousted president was heightened when it was learned that he had died just a few months after leaving office. But the dislike of Gray was more than this. Even one of his staunchest supporters on the Board of Regents, Judge Frank Clancy, spoke of his "personal peculiarities of manner and conduct which are not agreeable to all persons." He had an "Immense intellectual superiority" which grated on the Regents, many of the faculty, and townspeople.

Gray set out at once to reorganize the University. He established two colleges: Letters and Arts which granted the BA degree and Science and Engineering which

offered the BS. In addition there were the School of Education which awarded a bachelor of pedagogy, and the commercial and preparatory departments. In the College of Letters and Arts, of which Gray himself was dean, there were four curricula available: “A” which led to a BA in classics, “B,” modern languages, “C,” modern history, and “D,” literature.

The course offerings in history were more extensive and ambitious than before: for the freshman there were United States history in the first semester and in the second, English history from Henry VII to Victoria; sophomore, 16th and 17th centuries and the constitutional history of modern Europe; junior, the 18th century, England in the 19th, the Protestant Reformation, and Frederick the Great; senior, Europe since 1815, France, 1775 to 1815, and comparative history.

This curriculum is revealing of Gray’s attitudes and provides hints as to his standards which may be clues to the reasons for the hostility which was soon to arise toward the new president. To study history was, to Gray, to study European history, more suitable to an English or a continental university than to a small, struggling institution on the American frontier with barely 130 students. Clearly Gray was reacting against what he considered the parochialism of the University under Tight. Ancient and medieval history was still taught at the pre-college level as before, but now there was much less United States history—only one semester of it—and the history of New Mexico was dropped. This course which had been offered by Richards had been encouraged, it seems, by Tight, who had been the vice president of the Historical Society of New Mexico. A history course which celebrated this region, like the architecture which did honor to its culture, apparently was not highly respected by those who were shaping the territorial university.

The student body was not growing, and indeed it shrank between 1906 and 1911. New Mexico was on the eve of becoming a state of the union, and Gray complained that its foremost Institution was being held back by the niggardly policy of its legislature. The appropriation was only $36,000, making New Mexico by far the lowest of the state universities in financing. The next lowest, Montana, he wrote, received almost three times that much, and Arizona, which was even with New Mexico in progress toward statehood, received more than $130,000.

One of the most urgent needs, Gray insisted, was more money for history, economics, and philosophy. “The development of the History Department during the present year,” he wrote, “has revealed the pressing need of expansion of that Department of Instruction.”

At the time he made this spirited appeal in 1911 for more revenue to improve the quality of the liberal arts, he cited another “urgent request,” a residence for the president of the University. This university was the only state university except Oklahoma, he said, with no such residence. This request did not set well with the legislators, nor with many of the faculty. The University of New Mexico was no great favorite with many of the legislators. The College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts in Las Cruces had a larger body of students and faculty.

Gray had trouble with his faculty from the start of his administration. Besides the resentment of the firing of Dr. Tight, some were put off by Gray's manner and by what they saw as evidences of favoritism on his part. In a long letter to Governor William McDonald the President vented his anger. There was a conspiracy among the faculty, he said, to have him removed. Its core was in the College of Science and Engineering and its leader Dr. Martin Angell, professor of physics and mathematics, an "unscrupulous intriguer" who had marshaled others in that college in the conspiracy. Moreover, Angell had his "spy" in the College of Letters and Arts: Professor Leon Stephan, the German instructor, who "could not speak the language grammatically" and who "had the accent of a peasant." Indeed, he complained, the faculty generally was poor and there were few competent instructors.

One department in which the instruction was highly competent, however, was history. When Richards left and Gray himself assumed the professorship of history, he was aided by two assistants, Alice Schreiber for the courses In the Preparatory School and Erna Fergusson for the college courses. Each of these young women received $150 a year for her services. Erna Fergusson was still an undergraduate working to complete her own program in the junior and senior years while carrying a heavy burden in history instruction, but she "was doing an excellent job." If Gray is to be believed, she was subject to discrimination by some of the faculty because she was of the President's faction. After Gray's dismissal in 1912 he attempted in a meeting with his successor to secure a faculty position for Miss Fergusson, but without avail.

New Mexico became a state of the union on January 6, 1912, and the entire Board of Regents of the University was replaced. The new Board as its first important item of business terminated the presidency of Dr. Gray and appointed Dr. David Ross Boyd as his successor. Boyd was a former president of the University of Oklahoma and more recently he had served the Presbyterian Church as a Superintendent of Schools in the Home Missions Department. He was welcomed to the University as a westerner, in contrast to his predecessor, as a man who knew this section of the country, its people and its ways.

There was a clear understanding that the president, not the regents, would run the University. The regents met only infrequently, and most of the work was carried on by the executive committee of the Board, the three men who lived in or near Albuquerque. They would meet with Dr. Boyd in his office, and frequently he would vote on measures which came before the committee. The actions would then subsequently be ratified by the whole Board. This relationship between regents, president, and University was underscored by an action taken by the Regents in 1915. The Albuquerque Morning Journal had carried an editorial on January 7, which read as follows:

> The regents, in this, as in other states confine their work to the administration of fiscal affairs of the institutions, as a rule, and wisely let it end there, except for the selection of a president. Any board of regents that goes beyond the selection of the head of an institution, so far as the

> selection of a teaching force is concerned, works an injury rather than a benefit. The President should have an absolute voice in the selection of his corps of assistants, and his will should be law when it comes to the discharge of any one of them. If the Board is not willing to trust the President with such power it should get a President whom it can trust. Some boards in New Mexico have not seen fit to allow the President to have any particular voice in the hiring or discharge of teachers. They have arrogated that right to themselves, have used it for political purposes, and have made a botch of it in doing so.

The regents in their January meeting resolved that although New Mexico law directs the President of the Board of Regents to select and discharge faculty, "It is the judgment of this Board that it, and its successors, will do well to be governed by the advice" given in this editorial.

Boyd, then, was a strong president and, generally speaking, a successful one in managing the affairs of the University. He reorganized it into the following divisions: the College of Letters and Sciences, the School of Education, the School of Applied Science, the School of Household Economics, the Department of Music and Fine Arts, the Department of Physical Education, and the Division of University Extension.

Thus there was a single college. It had three parts: the languages: English, French, German, Spanish, Latin, and Greek, and the literature of each; the humanities: history and its sub-divisions, psychology, philosophy, economics, sociology, and political science; and the sciences: mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and all its subdivisions, and the "other so-called pure sciences." The degrees of BA and BS were offered and depended upon which courses had been taken. The president was, again, the acting dean of the College of Letters and Science.

After the departure of Dr. Gray and Miss Fergusson in 1912 there were two appointments of importance in the history of History at the University of New Mexico. One was Dr. Lynn Boal Mitchell who was named associate professor of classics; the other, Miss Nellie Dean, assistant professor of history. Mitchell seems to have taught some history during most if not all of his long stay at the University. Nellie Dean, who was also dean of women, remained only two years.

Enrollment of students seeking higher education at the University of New Mexico was still quite low, but it began to increase during the second decade of the twentieth century, and gradually the balance between the college and preparatory school students was shifting toward the former. In 1913 there were 65 college students and 21 preparatory.

There was a full array of fifteen history courses in the catalog. It is worthy of note that the History of New Mexico, which had been dropped by President Gray, was not restored at this time. Professor Dean was a busy person. Even though classes were small and it is probable that not all history classes were offered on a regular basis and some,

perhaps, not at all, she surely earned her salary of $1400. There was a History Club, of which she was the "critic," which met approximately every six weeks to discuss current events. The membership consisted of almost all of the students who were taking any history classes. In addition to her academic duties, Professor Dean had heavy responsibilities as dean of women. It seems she ran a tight ship at the women's dormitory. The yearbook for 1913 carried this little rhyme about her:

She upholds propriety, she's the Chaperona.
Life would lack variety, without her at Hokona.
Horror of publicity is native in her blood;
Amorous felicity, she nips it in the bud.

Professor Dean received some help from Professor Lynn Mitchell in the teaching of the history classes. One pair of his courses, Roman Political Institutions, was cross-listed as history. The description is rather interesting: "An investigation is made of Roman methods of dealing with the Initiative and Referendum, the Recall, the Tariff, and the government of cities, provinces, and protectorates." These were lively issues in American public affairs in the early years of the century, and it seems that Mitchell used the setting of political institutions in classical times to illustrate current American public affairs.

In 1914-15 there was another interval when the teaching of history was slighted and taken care of by faculty whose primary interests lay elsewhere. The Department of History and International Law consisted of one person, Associate Professor Proctor Sherwin, who had earned his bachelor's from St. Lawrence University and who came to New Mexico from graduate work at the University of Chicago. The full title of his appointment was associate professor of English Composition and History. There were two people in the English Department at this time, Professor Ethel Hickey who taught all the literature except Chaucer and Sherwin who taught Chaucer, International Law, and all the history that was offered except for Mitchell's courses.

It probably was something of a relief to Sherwin when, the next year, he was able to concentrate his efforts on English because of the arrival of Roscoe Hill, assistant professor of history. Hill was the first professional historian on the faculty of the University of New Mexico. When he arrived on campus in 1915 he was 35, a graduate of Eureka College. Later in life he would be awarded a LittD by the University of Chicago and a PhD by Columbia. He became an eminent scholar in Spanish and Latin-American history, and he served in various positions in the State Department, the National Archives, and the Library of Congress. In time he published histories of Spain, Cuba, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and Nicaragua. He taught at the University of New Mexico for three years in 1915-17 and 1919-20 during the interval between his two appointments. He was president of the Spanish-American Normal School at El Rito. While at the University he organized a School of Latin American Affairs, designed to develop and strengthen relations between the United States and Latin America and to meet the needs of the native population of the state.

It is informative to compare the history courses in 1914-15, the Sherwin period, with those for 1915-16, Hill's first year:

1914-15	1915-16
European History, 4000 BC-476 AD	*Modern European History
European History, 476-1300	*English History
European History, 1300-1715	
European History, 1715-1914	United States History, 1789-1829
English History, 55 BC-1603 AD	United States History, 1829-1916
	Latin America, Colonial
English History, 1603-1910	Latin America, the Republics
American History, 1492-1829	Latin Am, Geography & Resources
United States, 1829-1913	Latin Am, Trade & Transportation
*Current History	*Current Events
Intellectual History of Europe	*Spanish History
Roman Political Institutions	The Spaniards in the United States
	History of New Mexico
International Law and Diplomacy	*Elements of International Law
Bibliography & Study	Pro-Seminar: Bibliography,
Methods for Teachers	Methods, and Problems
	Relations of Lat Am & the US
	History of American Diplomacy

*Courses offered two semesters.

Comparison of Course Offerings, 191 4-1 916

During the First World War the University of New Mexico took on a different character. President Boyd responded to the requests of parents that their sons studying at the University receive military training. Plans for this were set up, but they had hardly taken shape by the time of the Armistice. A course in military history was initiated, to include among other subjects the causes of the war. Plans were laid for "war gardens" on university grounds, and 65 hogs were bought to eat the vegetables grown in the garden but not yet matured when frost arrived, so that this could be converted into pork, producing some revenue.

During the two years of Roscoe Hill's absence history courses were taught by a succession of instructors such as C. W. Hackett and Walter Prichard, neither of them remaining on the faculty for more than a year. Lynn Mitchell, professor of classics, became also professor of history, and William H. Partridge was employed as assistant professor of history and of classics. Roscoe 1- ambitious program for an emphasis on Spanish and Latin American history remained on the books, but it cannot be known whether instruction in these fields continued.

President David Ross Boyd had piloted the University of New Mexico through the difficult war years. By 1919 he had served seven years, the longest tenure of any president up to that time. A strong leader, he had the confidence of the faculty and regents to a greater extent than any of his predecessors, and he had ambitious plans for the improvement of the institution. But by the spring of 1919 he was discouraged. Unhappy with the appearance of the campus, he had devised plans for its improvement with a system of small lakes and ponds which he hoped to stock with trout and black bass. He wanted to build bird houses to attract wild birds. Besides these improvements, he was determined to secure increased appropriations for higher salaries and new offerings. Morale was low among the faculty because of the poor pay scale.

He did not secure what he believed to be essential for the future of the University. The governor and certain key political leaders rejected Boyd's plans for improvements to the grounds, and the prospects for improved appropriations were dim. On May 22, 1919, Boyd abruptly resigned, declaring that "the appropriation provided for the maintenance and operation of the University, for its improvement and enlargement, is so wholly inadequate as to make it, in my opinion, impossible to meet the public expectations, or the public's reasonable demands upon the institution."

The regents started at once to find a replacement and they read a letter from the students, drafted by the Student Council, calling for "the selection of a man who has no political or personal ties or affiliations which would handicap him; who has experience in university administration, who is young and virile enough to give the University the energy and leadership and Initiative needed."

The man who was found was Dr. David Spence Hill of the University of Illinois. Hill was appointed and given a contract for $5000, two hundred dollars more than Boyd was to have received. Hill, like Boyd before him, firmly believed in a strong presidency, and he made more of a point of asserting himself on this point, where Boyd had usually been content with the fact of power. Hill insisted on what he called a "managerial" administration, he being the manager. He, like some presidents before him, would in time cross swords with the faculty, and in particular with the history department.

It was clear early on that some of the faculty were not favorably impressed with David Spence Hill. Of the faculty of 28, eight resigned the first year, among them Professors Sherwin and Roscoe Hill. Roscoe Hill had already attracted some attention for his knowledge of Latin American affairs, and he was offered a position with the United States Department of State. The job was to start before the end of the academic year, and Professor Hill requested that President Hill release him from his faculty obligation on May 1, 1920, and he asked for his full year's salary. The written request was made in a letter dated April 6. The President was outraged. There had already been some faculty resignations on thirty days' notice, and he thought this very unprofessional. A professor should honor his contract! And now, here was Roscoe Hill asking to be released with less than thirty days' notice. He proposed to telescope his work and rush through the rest of his courses. The President told Roscoe Hill that this would be a grave mistake. It would injure the students and do him no good professionally. He offered to write to Secretary of

State Bainbridge Colby asking that the position be held until at least June 15. The Regents backed the president, and Professor Hill's departure from the campus was delayed until the end of the term.

History As a Service Department

It was in the decade of the 1920s that the University of New Mexico began to grow. In physical plant, in student body, in faculty, and, most importantly, in stature as an institution of higher learning. Before the end of the decade the University as a whole and the History Department in particular was beginning to make contributions to the advancement as well as the dissemination of knowledge. Before the 1920s practically all departments were one-person departments. By the end of the decade there was specialization as the need for additional faculty prompted more appointments in the larger departments.

President Hill made distinct contributions to the maturing of the University. He was determined to raise standards. In particular he was anxious to increase the number of PhDs, to increase the library holdings, and to check grade inflation. His accomplishments were important, but his reforms did not take place without much vexation, hurt feelings, and dissension.

On April 11, 1922, Hill received the welcome news that the University of New Mexico had at last been fully accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The gratification in this good news was diminished two years later, however, when a team of investigators from the Association of American Universities arrived on campus to make a survey of the University, and the result was that New Mexico was not included in the list of approved universities. Hill was particularly dismayed to learn that the University of Arizona was on the list. He wrote to Adam L Jones, the chairman of the Committee on the Classification of Colleges, to ask the reason, and was told that "the equipment for carrying on some of the department fundamentals in a college of liberal arts appeared to be very scanty and incomplete, though provision for other departments seemed to be excellent." But it was more than this. Jones had added that "the future support of the University along with the very considerable number of other state institutions in a state with a relatively small population seemed to be a serious question."

A few months after assuming the presidency, Hill made a report to the Regents on the state of the University, those things which were gratifying and those which caused him concern, It was with pleasure that he reported that the preparatory school had been eliminated entirely. There were almost 250 students, all of college grade and (he declared with obvious satisfaction) sixty percent of them men. Some of the faculty without advanced degrees had Informed him that they would proceed to take graduate work and earn doctorates. Some, however, had declined to do so. There was an associate professor of English whom Hill singled out for special notice. She had been on the faculty since 1901, and she had been one of the targets of President Gray's criticism nine years earlier. It was not without significance to Hill that she was the sister of a former judge in the state

of New Mexico. In 1921 Hill wrote to suggest to her that she go to graduate school and work on advanced degrees, but she had not acquiesced. In addition, he then wrote to her, "your expression of hostility to my administration as spoken before the Board and Faculty during June, 1920 have made it difficult for you to cooperate with me." He decided, therefore, to recommend against a renewal of her appointment. If, however, she changed her mind and proceeded to earn a PhD, he would see to it that she receive a three-year leave of absence. She did not do so, and she was discontinued. There were other similar actions taken by Hill in what he insisted was his campaign to upgrade the faculty of the University.

This English professor had not been alone in her criticism of President Hill. During his first year in office there had been quite a bit of grumbling from faculty who could see in his "managerial" system nothing less than autocracy. The disgruntled faculty was given the opportunity to air their grievances in a series of conferences with the Board of Regents. The Albuquerque Morning Journal had published a story on June 13, 1920, about these grievance meetings in which faculty members had been able to express themselves freely and frankly. Hill also had been given the chance to defend himself, stating that he was determined to improve educational standards. On this occasion the Regents had vindicated Hill completely, but it appears that the English professor's frankness at this meeting was later used by Hill as a reason for letting her go.

Although President Hill seems to have believed, as did many educators of his generation, that higher education was most appropriate to men and probably preferred to preside over a university in which most of the student body was male, he does not seem to have had a preference for Anglos. it was a matter of serious concern to him that in the state with a population of about a half million, the majority of them "being of Spanish-American or Mexican descent," very few of this majority were receiving an education. These people had been loyal patriots in the war and could be counted on as loyal citizens of the United States, but the number who received a high school education was very small, and, of course, "very few of them ever enter the University."

This had been true from the beginning of the University. The annual rosters of students during the 1890s showed two or three at the most, and in the first two decades of the twentieth century there were never more than five with Spanish surnames. The same was not true of the Boards of Regents. By the time of Drs. Boyd and Hill usually two of the five members were of Hispanic descent.

Hill seems to have been more sensitive to the interests of New Mexico's Hispanic population than others in the University's leadership. He brought to the faculty Assistant Professor Hannibal Ibarra y Rojas, and subsequently supported him with a salary increase over the objections of Professor Mitchell, who was at the time the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Mitchell, who had a low opinion of Ibarra y Rojas, attempted to get him discharged, but Hill defended him. The issue soon passed with the professor's resignation.

In 1920 President Hill appointed Charles Florus Coan as Roscoe Hill's successor as associate professor of history. Coan, a recent PhD from the University of California, was the author of a study of Indian nations of the Pacific northwest. Four years after his arrival he was advanced in rank to professor, and he remained at the University for the rest of his life. His salary increased slowly from $2400 to $2800. Coan admired the architectural style which William G. Tight had introduced for University buildings fifteen years earlier and was one of those responsible for the continuation and furthering of the modified pueblo. He helped to draw plans for a pueblo style campus and, with help from his student Frank Driver Reeve, built a house for himself just south of the campus on Harvard Drive Southeast. This was later the home of Professor France Scholes for many years.

Hill continued to work toward the raising of standards at the University. He secured a considerably larger appropriation for the library, and in 1922 he was able to buy the Joseph R. Wilson library of 171 French, Italian, Spanish, and Latin books "of ancient issue" for $500. Professor Coan estimated their value at $10,000. Hill made appointments of PhDs like Coan whenever possible. He watched professors' grade distributions and expressed his displeasure when one passed too many students or gave too many high grades.

Hill's concern about grade inflation was a factor in an estrangement between him and Professor Coan. The 1923 survey of grades showed that the general average throughout the University of the students who passed was 89%. Coan passed 91%, and the president was displeased. At the same time, however, Coan was no sluggard. He worked hard and had a heavy teaching load. In the first semester of 1923-24 students in his classes numbered 196, which was by far the largest number of any faculty member. George St. Clair, professor of English, had the second highest number, 173. Clearly two departments which needed an increase in teaching staff were English and history, the latter at the time combined with political science. In 1925 Hill hired two new professors who would be important members of the faculty in years to come: George Pope Shannon in English, later to be dean of Arts and Sciences, and James Fulton Zimmerman in history/political science, soon to be president of the University.

Zimmerman was brought to the faculty with a higher salary than Coan received. Coan grumbled about this fact with others of the faculty, and the news of the muttering reached the ears of President Hill, who upbraided him in a tactless way, informing him that "the reason Dr. Zimmerman is paid the salary which he will receive is that we thought he was worth it." He reminded Coan of kindnesses and consideration shown him, such as an extra $75 for a year's service as acting chairman of the department, and a time when Coan was ill and Hill covered his class for him, without any charge.

This was not the first time sparks had flown between the president and the history professor. In 1924 Coan authored a history of New Mexico in three volumes, published by the American Historical Society (not, Hill remarked to the Regents, the prestigious American Historical Association). The first volume was text, written by Coan. The other two volumes consisted of biographical sketches of prominent New Mexicans in flowery

language, often accompanied by portraits. Presumably the publication had been financed mainly by subscriptions of those whose sketches were included. Hill was shocked to learn that Coan's name, followed by "of the State University of New Mexico," was to be on the title page of each of the three volumes. The three book, Hill complained, was "a matter of no little comment — both amused and contemptuous."

Coan defended himself. As the author of the first volume, 300,000 words of sound scholarship, he had acted professionally. He conceded that the biographical sketches and portraits were done with his consent but were not written by him. Hill wrote to the manager of the American Historical Society and the firm agreed to delete "of the State University of New Mexico" after Coan's name and make it clear that Coan had nothing to do with the biographies. The matter passed, but it was not forgotten by President Hill. It is not without interest that the only University person whose sketch and portrait were among the roughly eight hundred "prominent New Mexicans" was Coan. The first president of the University, Elias Stover, was included, and also one man who had taught at the University for a short time in the first decade. Besides these, no University people were included.

David Spence Hill's administration as president of the University of New Mexico had never been without controversy. He had accomplished a great deal in raising the standards, securing highly qualified professors, and extending the reach of the University to meet more of the needs of the state. The number and probably the quality of students and faculty had been increased, salaries had been raised, though not spectacularly, and perhaps most importantly, an important start had been made on the research function of the institution.

But his manner had been abrasive, his language often tactless. He had angered some influential people of the state. He had quarreled with the highly respected chemistry professor John D. Clark and with the "Old Roman," classics professor Lynn Mitchell, whom he had removed as dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. He had strong defenders including former regents like Thomas B. Keleher and former governor 0. A. Larrazolo. But in 1927 the Regents decided that as a practical matter his liabilities exceeded his assets, and his resignation was accepted. J. Fulton Zimmerman, professor of political science, was named first acting president and then president of the University of New Mexico.

At the beginning of the Zimmerman administration the University had bright prospects. Enrollment was up and so was the size of the faculty. In the late 1 920s there arrived on campus some of the great scholars who are now remembered by the names of buildings on campus, like Edward Castetter, Stuart Northrop, and France Scholes. Scholes first arrived on campus in January, 1925, with a Master's degree from Harvard and teaching experience at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He came to New Mexico as a "lunger," a tuberculosis victim who was attracted to the southwest for his health. He was employed as a part-time instructor in European history after he had satisfied President Hill with a doctor's certificate that he had no TB in communicable form. He remained only one term, leaving in the fall semester to accept a full-time

position at the Colorado College. He returned in 1928, and although he left in 1931 to spend fifteen years with the Carnegie Foundation, not returning until 1946, he was a luminary who greatly increased the stature of the University and particularly the history department.

Charles Coan died suddenly in 1928; his student and protégé Frank D. Reeve joined the faculty and remained for almost forty years. Marion Dargan, a University of Chicago PhD specializing in early American history, came to New Mexico in 1927, and Lansing Bloom joined the faculty in 1929. The graduate school which had begun operations in a very small way about the same time as the College in 1897, broadened its scope to include the humanities. President Zimmerman's philosophy was that the University of New Mexico should specialize in those fields in which its location and setting gave it a natural advantage and emphasized southwestern and borderlands history, language, geology, and anthropology. One of the results of this was that in history the Southwest came to be emphasized, and historians like Dargan turned their attention away from their main fields of competence to New Mexico. This would in time cause serious complications.

The master's program, which at its start had been confined to such sciences as biology, was broadened to embrace such liberal arts as history. Five masters of arts in history were earned in 1933, and before the end of the decade of the 1930s history, along with anthropology, southwestern literature, and Spanish language, was ready to accept doctoral candidates.

The scholars in the History Department were the most active in the University in the publication of books and articles. Between 1932 and 1934 there were 29 publications by UNM historians.

Zimmerman proved to be a highly successful president. Rather a stickler for rules and procedures, he was generally admired by faculty and students. There was considerably more faculty governance in his presidency than in any previous administration. He was generally on good terms with regents and state political leaders.

The University enjoyed only three or four years of happy times under its new administration before the Great Depression engulfed the land. At the end of 1932 Zimmerman declared, in what proved to be a great understatement that "this biennium comes to an end in the midst of one of three or four major economic crises which the nation has faced." The University began the biennium with an approved budget of $380,000 annually, but at the start of the twentieth fiscal year it was reduced by $10,090, first by the discovery in an audit that without its knowledge the University had been overpaid and secondly because income from lands was way off. In the next year the budget was reduced to $353,000 and all salaries were cut by ten percent. Soon thereafter there was a second reduction of 25%.

But as of this time (the end of October 1932) enrollment had not declined; indeed, it had increased, and indications were that this would continue. Most state universities

had fewer students; New Mexico was one of the few which experienced the reverse. Therefore, said Zimmerman, “unlike the ordinary business enterprise, we have been unable to reduce expenses by reducing output.”

The University met this challenge by several means: tuition increases, reduction of salaries, increases in the teaching load, postponing the filling of vacancies and of library purchases, reducing the expenditures for research, publication, and travel, postponing the purchase of laboratory equipment, doing no more building except where special funds were provided, and abandoning plans to replace the deficient heating plan units.

A special faculty meeting was called to explain the necessity of salary cuts for fiscal 1932-33. Zimmerman commended the attitude of the faculty, which voted confidence in the regents and the administration. Some of the faculty suggested that the faculty present a minstrel show to raise money for various campus needs, but this was thought to be undignified and the motion lost. Another motion was made, but voted down, that “the student body of the University be informed that the General Faculty is.. . of opinion that definite periods devoted to reflective thought are essential to the welfare of the students, and in order to make such time available. . . the students ought to hold the evenings and all Sundays free, so far as this is reasonably possible, from social engagements.”

When Scholes left the history department in 1931 the remaining faculty consisted of Bloom, Dargan, and Reeve. There was a temporary half-time instructor, John C. Russell, who served only one year. In the next year Benjamin Sacks, who had studied at New Mexico as an undergraduate, was given a half- time appointment teaching European history with a specialization in early twentieth- century Great Britain. Except for time out to take his doctorate at Stanford, Sacks stayed on until his retirement in the mid 1960s.

In 1935, as the nation was painfully beginning to pull out of the devastating depression and the University to raise back to the level it had achieved in 1930, there was an important addition to the history faculty with the arrival of George Peter Hammond, a distinguished specialist in southwestern history. For the ten years Hammond was on the faculty, he served not only as head of the history department but also as dean of the Graduate School and dean of the upper division of the College of Arts and Sciences. Hammond was elected the national president of the history honorary fraternity, Phi Alpha Theta, and the Sigma Chapter was chartered at the University in 1936.

During the 1 930s the history department was reaching national recognition as a research institution in southwestern history. Bloom did important research work in Italy and Spain, and through the Rockefeller Foundation archival materials were gathered in the University library. More than a hundred thousand pages of photostatic material was brought from archives in Spain and Mexico.

In 1935 another important faculty position was filled with the appointment of Dorothy Woodward, who had her PhD from Yale and who took over the major

responsibility for the courses in Latin American history, the national period. Thus there was a return to the direction in which Roscoe Hill had attempted to point the University twenty years earlier. In 1941 Professor Joaquin Ortega joined the faculty as director of the School of Inter-American Affairs, and gave further emphasis to this important part of the mission of the University of New Mexico.

The Second World War impacted dramatically on the University. President Zimmerman announced on January 1, 1943, that "the first obligation of the University is its share In the winning of the war. The second obligation is the preservation of our basic educational program on all fronts, and the third and final obligation is that of preparation for the tasks which will be required of us when peace comes. While doing everything within our power to assist in winning the war, we are not going to forget the long-time duties of a university which are ours during war and during peace also."

The dean of the College of Arts and Sciences saw as the prime obligation "the maintenance of a framework able to withstand numerous pressures toward a degradation of scholarship. . . . Following the war, the College should be able not only to restore its former standards fully, but to advance them more nearly toward their rightful place." There were serious problems to be faced: replacing teaching personnel going into the services, fluctuating student enrollment and continuous adjustment of class loads and sizes, the maintenance of standards, student and faculty morale, and the lack of financial resources.

There were more than forty leaves of absence among the faculty for military or other governmental service. Benjamin Sacks and Dorothy Woodward of the history department went into the service. Mirage, the University yearbook, reported that half of the student body consisted of "sailors sent to college by the Navy Department," and the 1945 issue contained pictures of 36 seniors, including 22 men, all in uniform; 59 juniors, 28 of the 32 men uniformed; 53 sophomores, 23 of the 25 men in uniform; and 137 freshmen, 67 of them men, 58 in uniform.

At the end of the war there arrived a huge influx of undergraduates, and some important changes in the faculty of the department of history. Lansing Boom retired at the end of the academic year in 1945. George Hammond resigned to assume the directorship of the Bancroft Library in Berkeley, and France Scholes returned to New Mexico where he spent the rest of his distinguished career, and he assumed the deanship of the Graduate School. Josiah Cox Russell was appointed as the head of the history department. Russell, a Harvard PhD, was a pioneer In demographic historical research, with medieval England as his research field.

In October 1944 President Zimmerman died suddenly, and there began a long period of almost ten months before his successor arrived to take up his duties. In the meanwhile the Council of Deans carried the executive authority and much of the governance of the University rested with the Faculty Senate, which at the time consisted of all deans and faculty who had served two years or more. It was hoped that when the new president took over his duties much authority would be retained by the faculty. The

new president, J. Philip Wernette, arrived in August 1945, to begin what would be a short and controversy-ridden administration of three years.

Two additional assistant professors were brought into the history department, each destined to serve only a short time in the late 1940s: Martine Emert and Enrique Lugo-Silva. By 1949 these had both departed, and George Winston Smith and John E. Longhurst joined the faculty. Smith, an Illinois PhD, was a specialist in the middle period of American history, particularly the Civil War; Longhurst was a Spanish Renaissance scholar whose doctorate was from Michigan. The history department, therefore, consisted of eight persons: Russell, Scholes, Sacks, Dargan, Reeve, Woodward, Smith, and Longhurst. Scholes, however, had administrative duties and taught rather little, and Reeve's teaching load was reduced by his being the editor of the New Mexico Historical Review. In the budget for the late 1940s there was an item which testified to the scholarly maturity of this University: an amount was set aside for "historical research."

Professor Russell had ambitious plans for the history department at the University of New Mexico and particularly for the graduate program. How could this department possibly hope to compete with better known institutions In far wealthier states, in training PhDs to occupy positions of prestige in the nation's universities and thereby assume roles of importance in the history profession throughout the country? Russell had a plan for achieving this objective despite the meager resources. He would offer prospective graduate students a package which would enable them to earn the PhD, get teaching experience and a publication record, all within about three years. Thus doctors of philosophy in history from the University of New Mexico would be in a strong position to compete, while still comparatively young, for the top openings in the country. This would be accomplished by welcoming a young graduate student with the offer of a teaching assistantship in which he would have responsibility for undergraduate classes, and the publication of his dissertation in the History Monograph Series of the University of New Mexico Press.

Some of Russell's colleagues questioned the merit of this "package" plan. They were afraid it would endanger scholarly standards, lead to the teaching of undergraduates by inexperienced instructors, attract some less talented graduate students, and threaten the integrity of the Monograph Series. To his critics Russell's plan smacked a bit of mass production.

Russell found upon his arrival that there was an undesirable situation in that of the six members of the department only two, Benjamin Sacks and himself, were Europeanists and the other four, Scholes, Dargan, Reeve, and Woodward, had research interests in the American southwest. The arrival of Russell might have been expected to correct this imbalance somewhat, but in fact it did not because Reeve and Woodward, who had been teaching European history outside their fields, now felt free to transfer to American history and the Southwest in particular. This aggravated the crowded situation in the borderlands area. Russell secured an agreement among the four whereby all should be permitted to direct students and give courses in this, their preferred field, subject to the needs and interests of the students. This calmed things for the time being but did not

really solve the dilemma. It remained an uncomfortable situation and may have been a source of intradepartmental tensions in the years which followed.

Factions arose in the department in the early 1950s, taking the shape of pro- and anti-Russell parties. Critics of the head of the department complained that his grading standards were lax and that he played favorites. It was around this time that throughout the University the title of department administrator was changed from “head” to “chairman,” and this was taken to mean that departments should be more democratically administered than before.

In 1951 the imbalance was relieved slightly when Marion Dargan retired and was succeeded by William M. Dabney, a University of Virginia PhD, who took over the colonial and revolutionary period of American history. By this time, also, Longhurst was on hand to add to the strength in European history, and Smith, a Civil War historian, only rarely showed any inclination to move into the crowded Southwest field.

In 1952-53 Russell was on leave of absence teaching in Wales. The University administration, after consulting with the members of the history department and determining that the majority of the members favored a change, replaced Russell as chairman and named Benjamin Sacks to take his place. Russell did not accept this change passively and upon his return in the fall of 1953 protested heatedly. Department meetings were often acrimonious and there was danger that the division was threatening to involve the graduate students and even undergraduates.

Professor Sacks, who had not sought and did not enjoy the office of chairman, resigned in 1955,. and William Dabney was named acting chairman, serving in this capacity for more than two years until a permanent chairman was brought in from outside the University. The years of Dabney’s acting chairmanship were difficult and rancorous. Dabney was the junior person in the department, an assistant professor without tenure, and he did not feel he was in a position to give strong leadership to the department. But strong leadership was needed. Morale was rather low, teaching loads were high. The Comptroller’s report on salaries in 1955-56 showed that for the history department the cost per student was $8.54, the third lowest in the University.

The requirements for a major in history were thirteen semester courses (they were expressed in courses rather than hours because there were a few two-credit courses which could be used to meet the requirements). The major needed to take the two courses in western civilization, either the United States history pair or the Americas pair, and one course in either ancient or English history, totaling five semester courses in the lower division. Requirements in the upper division were three in European, three in American, and two in Hispanic-American history. The history major was also expected to acquire a reading knowledge of a foreign language.

Instructions to prospective majors also included the following information: “The student should remember that course work is only one approach to the achievement of a sound foundation in history. A second approach is to carry on an independent program of

reading history books, particularly during the off months in the summer vacation period." There followed a list of twenty-seven "interesting, readable, and substantial writings," with the advice that the student dip into as many of these as possible. This was for the freshmen and sophomores. Juniors and seniors were given another list of ten books to fill in the gaps in the traditional history areas where course work was not taken. Upper division students were reminded that they would take the Graduate Record Examination which tests both their general education knowledge and their history knowledge. These recommended books included Ancient, Medieval, Modern, American, and Hispanic American works. Except for the Latin American titles, the list contained none outside of western civilization.

In 1949 the Regents adopted a salary scale as follows: instructors, $30004200; assistant professors, $3800-5000; associate professors, $4600-5800; professors, $5400- and up. In that year the history department salaries were: Scholes (who was also academic vice president) $10,000; Russell, $6000; Dargan, $5400; Reeve, $5200; Sacks, $5400; and Woodward, $5000. Six years later salaries were as follows: Russell, $7200; Sacks, $7200; Reeve, $6900; Woodward, $6700; Smith, $5900; Longhurst, $5700; and Dabney, $5400 (including the $200 extra as acting chairman). There were five graduate assistants and each received $1300.

These salaries were not unusual. They were comparable to what faculty of like rank was receiving in other departments. But salaries throughout the University were disturbingly low, and the combination of large enrollments, heavy teaching loads, low salaries, and poor fringe benefits was hurtful to morale. Back in 1947 President Wernette presented a powerful argument "to the Legislature and the People of New Mexico." He called attention to the fact that the appropriation amount per student, roughly $200 per student per year, was smaller than it had been before the war: from 1929 to 1940 the average annual appropriation per student was $216, and costs of various kinds have risen about 50% above pre-war. Wernette presented a survey of twelve state universities in the Midwest and west, and found that New Mexico was next to lowest. He also presented figures for the six state institutions which showed that the appropriation per student ranged from $647 at the School of Mines to $196 at the University of New Mexico.

President Tom L Popejoy, who succeeded Wernette in 1949 and who had a far better rapport with faculty and political leaders than his predecessor, was able to secure improvements in the salary scale. For example, in the middle of the academic year 1955-56, Popejoy and the regents decided that it was possible to distribute a certain amount of money to all the faculty. In December the acting chairman of the History Department was informed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences that $2400 was available to be divided up among the faculty members immediately. Each faculty member received an increase of $300 or slightly more. France Scholes, the academic vice president at this time, was wary about making the distribution in this way. He would have preferred to provide a bonus for everyone rather than an increase which would have to be the starting point in future, but he was overruled.

History As A Professional Department

The retirement of Professor Dorothy Woodward in 1957 necessitated securing a replacement in Latin American history, and furnished an opportunity for finding a new department chairman. After a thorough search, the administration decided upon Edwin Lieuwen, a 35-year-old Latin Americanist with the State Department whose study of the history of oil in Venezuela had flagged him as a corner in Latin-American affairs. He joined the faculty in the fall semester of 1957 as associate professor of history at a salary of $9600.

Lieuwen set to work immediately and energetically to bring about changes in the department, and for that matter, in the University. His program did not call for a larger faculty at first, but a great increase in the number of graduate assistants, which would have the effect of enlarging the number of graduate students and reducing the faculty teaching load from 12 to 9 hours. In each of the survey classes in western civilization and United States history there would be two lectures a week by the professor, and the third class meeting would be a small drill section with about 20 students.

Thus in the second semester, 1957-58, Professor Sacks, for example offered his section of Western Civilization, meeting the whole class on Monday and Wednesday at 11. He had two graduate assistants, each of whom met five drill sections of approximately 20 students each at various hours on Thursday, Friday, arid Saturday. Professors Lorighurst, Russell, Smith, and Dabney also taught large survey courses with the same arrangements.

Lieuwen reported to the Dean on May 5 that in general the new system had been a success. “We cannot tell as yet whether the instructional cost per student is below what it would be if the old plan of organization and teaching were kept. This results from the fact that there was a slight decline in the general enrollment in the second semester,” he declared. “However, because of this University-wide enrollment drop, we were able to change over to the new plan without additional expense.” He went on to say that standards had been maintained, and perhaps even higher standards might be achieved, since more written work could be asked of the undergraduates. The faculty had had to spend more time reorganizing their courses and supervising the new program, but this added burden should last only for a year and then the administrative and reorganization chores would decrease. “The added work in reorganizing these courses has been more than compensated for by the reduction in teaching load to 9 hours,” allowing more time to accelerate research. Most, but not all, of the faculty and assistants were highly favorable toward the new pattern. The students’ reactions were surveyed by a questionnaire, and a large majority of them considered the system more effective and more beneficial to them.

It was expected that this system would provide graduate students with teaching experience, and the professors were supposed to take responsibility for supervising their assistants. Different faculty members responded to this duty with different levels of earnestness, and as time passed under the new system of teaching the large surveys, there was something of a decline in the seriousness of the faculty supervision.

The budget for the History Department rose markedly in the decade following Professor Lieuwen's arrival, both in absolute terms and in comparison with others. In 1956-57 the appropriation for history was eighth in the Arts and Sciences College after English, modern languages, math, biology, chemistry, physics, and geology. In 1964-65 it was fifth, after English, math, modern languages, and biology. The appropriation per student remained low, however, since one of the objectives of Lieuwen's system had been to reduce the need for employing new faculty.

Even so, there was an urgent need to increase the size of the staff. There were several fields of history which had been neglected entirely or paid insufficient attention. In the five years after 1957 specialists were added in Russian history, colonial Latin America, the Far East, recent American, and ancient history, and more emphasis was given to the Southwest and borderlands.

In the early 1960s the salary scale at the University of New Mexico had improved. A survey of the Rocky Mountain area universities showed that this university ranked second in salaries of professors, associate and assistant professors, though instructors received much less than their counterparts of other institutions.

Enrollments were rising rapidly at all levels. A "tidal wave" of undergraduates, which Dean Dudley Wynn had anticipated and warned of in the middle l950s was now a reality, and the history department along with others devoted attention to the problem of coping with this influx without sacrificing standards. There was much introspection and debate over the comparative merits and shortcomings of large lecture sections, lectures reinforced by drill sections, and small classes.

The number of graduate students in history was also on the increase. In 1958 the MA program was altered to create a "Plan Two" degree which required six more hours of course work but no thesis. Whereas in the comprehensive examination the "Plan One" student had to demonstrate his competence in one field of history, those in "Plan Two" defended two. This new plan was "principally for students who do not plan to continue graduate work beyond the MA," and in particular it was designed to provide a program of study better suited than the thesis program for the prospective high school history teacher. The principal goal would be competence in teaching rather than research. From the very start, however, the majority of the graduate students, including those who intended to go for the doctorate, elected Plan Two. They decided that since as doctoral candidates they would have to defend several fields, this plan would enable them to get an earlier start in that direction. The department was disappointed, moreover, to find that very few high school teachers, actual or prospective, sought masters' degrees in history. Thus a large part of the rationale for Plan Two did not pan out.

Admissions to the doctoral program increased, and a gratifying number of exceptionally gifted students earned their PhDs in the decade of the 1960s. By the end of the decade there were 32 graduate assistants, as well as graduate students receiving grants of various sorts.

In the early 1960s there were several important changes in the history faculty. The department lost some of its most distinguished professors and brought others into Its ranks. Professors Scholes and Reeve retired in 1962 and in the next three years Professors Sacks, Russell, and Longhurst left the University of New Mexico. Among those who joined the faculty around this time were Gerald Nash, Donald Cutter, and Frank lklé. Eminent historians Including Foster Rhea Dulles, George W. F. Hailgarten, and John F. Bannon came to the campus as visiting professors.

The case of Josiah Russell requires special attention. The action by the administration replacing him as department chairman did not relieve the discord, and what had begun as intradepartmental squabbling grew into a controversy Involving professors in several departments and President Popejoy. The President contended that Russell's attitude and deportment, far from mellowing as time passed, became increasingly injurious to the University. The dispute reached a high point in 1959 when Popejoy decided that Russell's usefulness to the University was far outweighed by the damage he did. Accordingly, on August 13, 1959, he wrote to Russell informing him that he would be retired on his 60th birthday, which was then thirteen months away. This involuntary retirement of a tenured faculty member was done under a provision in the state's Educational Retirement Act which had been passed in 1957.

Russell contested this action by an appeal to the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, which held hearings on the issue and then declared that the retirement of Russell was justified because of his "persistent, inaccurate, and distorted understanding of faculty-community- administration relationships." The committee did, however, express some concern about the principle of involuntary retirement in the 1957 act.

Russell next placed the matter before the American Association of University Professors, which sent an investigating team to the campus to look into the question. The investigators expressed their concern that their observations and the testimony they heard did not justify the action against Professor Russell. They believed that Russell had been dealt with in an arbitrary manner.

Meanwhile Russell took a sabbatical leave for what was expected to be his last year at the University of New Mexico, and after a search another medievalist was appointed to replace him. This new faculty member was, ironically enough, another Russell — Jeffrey B. Russell, an Emory University PhD, who joined the faculty in 1960-61. Josiah Russell, meanwhile, appealed to the District Court, arguing that the Educational Retirement Act of 1957 did not provide for the involuntary retirement of a tenured faculty member, and on January 6, 1961, Judge James Scarborough ruled in his favor. Russell returned to his teaching duties in the second semester, and for a while the History Department had two medievalists, both named Russell. Jeffrey Russell left this tangled mess and since 1961 has pursued his career elsewhere. Josiah Russell stayed on as professor of history until 1965, when he voluntarily retired and accepted a position at the Texas College of Arts and Industries at Kingsville.

From the perspective of 1986 the early 1960s seem quite Idyllic. But historians should know better than most people that such impressions can be deceptive. When there are no great concerns to worry us, we seem to find and blow way up out of proportion lesser ones. But the mid 1960s now seem like a good time in academe. The Woodrow Wilson National Scholarship foundation was concerned with finding promising young seniors to attract into the college teaching profession. There were good jobs in liberal arts faculties.

The University of New Mexico history department was in healthy condition. Some great scholars and teachers had left, but others had joined the faculty. Enrollments were high; the graduate program was flourishing and the UNM PhDs found good positions. History at the University of New Mexico enjoyed a good reputation.

The graduate program was strengthened, especially in Latin American and American Indian history, by grants from the Ford and Doris Duke Foundations. The Ford grant provided $315,000 for a six-year period, from 1965 to 1971, to bring in three new faculty specialists, provide four three-year doctoral fellowships, support research grants, and add more than 50,000 volumes to the library. In 1969-70 there were 32 graduate assistantships in history and 21 other grants or fellowships (including Title IV, Title VI, as well as Ford). This academic year was the high-water mark. In 1970-71 the numbers were still 32 assistantships but only fourteen others; in 1971-72 there were 30 and five; in 1972-73, 26 and five; and in 1973-74, 23 and two.

In the last five years of the 1960s the history department, like the University in general and most such institutions throughout the country, was in commotion. The Vietnam war had riven the nation and driven deep wedges in the academic community. Undergraduate enrollments were still growing, but academic positions were drying up, and men and women with graduate degrees were having trouble finding jobs, so fewer people were entering graduate programs.

There was growing concern about the quality of undergraduates entering the University and about the instruction they were receiving. Starting in 1975 ACT scores showed a decided drop, and the Associate Provost declared that “Faculty members must now adjust their teaching to reflect the presence of large numbers of students who are inadequately prepared to do university-level work.”

One healthy development at the University was that more serious consideration was being given to the quality of teaching. A committee of the Arts and Sciences College was taking a hard look at the effectiveness of instruction, and the history department was paying close attention to the huge lecture sections of freshmen. The drill section system of using graduate students to assist the professors, which had offered so much promise, was now questioned. Critics suspected that certain faculty took their obligation to oversee and train prospective teachers lightly and saw in the system only a slightly reduced teaching load.

In 1969 the “Love-Lust” poem controversy shattered the calm and made the University into a political issue in the state. This touched the history department only lightly and will be given little space in this study, but in that it called into question the judgment and responsibility of graduate students who taught classes of freshmen and in that it led to a sharp cut in the University’s appropriations, it had an effect on all departments. President Popejoy had retired in July 1968, and was succeeded by Ferrel Heady, so it was on Heady that the roof threatened to fall in.

This ugly incident passed, though the sore that was scratched open was a long time in healing. No sooner did the campus get back to normal than another, even more tragic incident disturbed the peace. All through the academic year 1969-70 there were sporadic confrontations between critics of the Vietnam war and supporters of the government policy. Upon the invasion of Cambodia in the spring the protests intensified, and on May 4 the bloody incident at Kent State University in Ohio fanned reactions all across the country, including the University of New Mexico. It was by chance on this very day that Jane Fonda spoke on campus to urge “non-violent and rigorous protest of Nixon’s Cambodian policy,” but though she spoke for non-violence, her speech detonated violence on campus. Activists called on the faculty and students to strike. Classes as usual, university activities as usual, were impossible, they insisted, in such times.

The strike deeply divided the university community. Some faculty supported it vigorously, some opposed it vigorously. The history department was divided. One professor escorted Jane Fonda to and from her speech and was a vociferous supporter of the strike. Another member of the history faculty sent a telegram to Governor David Cargo urging him to prepare to use the National Guard against the campus radicals.

The week of May 4-11 was the most turbulent in the history of the University. The climax came on the evening of Friday the 8th, when the National Guard marched on campus to evict students occupying the Union, wounded several people in the process, and left the University community In an uproar. A measure of calm returned the next week, but for all educational purposes the academic year ended prematurely.

The fall session began with fewer scars of the recent trauma than most people had feared. There was some decline in the graduate enrollment in history, but the undergraduate program continued to grow. The history department had long been admired for its excellence in teaching. From the time of Charles F. Coan onward history had been regarded as one of the finest teaching departments in the University. Also the scholarly attainments of a number of the faculty members were noteworthy. When Gerald Nash was selected for the University’s foremost recognition of scholarship, the delivery of the Annual Research Lecture in the fall of 1970, he was the third historian to receive this honor, the others having been France Scholes and Edwin Lieuwen. In April 1971 Dean Nathaniel Woilman called attention to the number of “illustrious scholars” and observed that history was a department which has always had “a certain luster on the campus which other departments have not had.”

But in that same year two of the most popular professors, Warren Wagar and Gunther Rothenberg, resigned to take positions elsewhere, thus seriously weakening the European history field. Although fine men and women were found to fill positions during the decade of the 1970s some of this “luster” was dimmed. In 1971 It was reported that the graduate deans meeting in Miami had failed to identify the University of New Mexico History Department as a department of strength, and on campus the Graduate School issued what came to be known as the “Spolsky Report” which noted the lack of productivity among some department faculty and suggested that there was something seriously remiss in the history graduate program. Another concern was an apparent lack of collegiality among the history faculty.

In March 1972, a three-man committee of distinguished scholars was invited to the campus under the auspices of the Danforth Foundation to survey the history department and call attention to its strengths and weaknesses. The committee, chaired by Professor Stephen Graubard and including Professors Ray Billington and John J. Johnson, found much to praise. The quality of instruction is “good to excellent,” the committee reported. “How else is one to explain the number of History courses that are not required and that attract so many undergraduates?” It concerned the visitors, however, that there was so much reliance on large lecture courses. (By this time the drill section system which had been introduced in 1958 had been abandoned.) There should be more small group classes, more colloquia, more opportunities for interested students to study a few major problems in great depth. There was far too much preoccupation with numbers—the size of enrollments. The Danforth trio believed that pressure for the professors to pack into their classes lots of students came from the University administration, which seemed to equate numbers of students taught with one’s value to the University, a very unhealthy attitude. The investigators noted the poor morale, especially among junior faculty and graduate students, the lack of collegiality, and the poor communications within the department.

There were eight recommendations for improvements. Some had to do with the undergraduate program such as more small classes and more assignment of senior people to large survey classes, but mostly they addressed shortcomings in the graduate program. The history department should be more selective in admitting students to its graduate school but then more flexible in the degree requirements. “We know of no department in the country with such a rigidly structured examination schedule,” the visitors reported. They were also keenly aware of the need for more staff, including more senior staff. The European history section was especially weak in this respect, they declared.

Some members of the history department believed that the Danforth Committee report was more negative than was deserved, but the value of several of the recommendations was recognized, and during the next few years efforts were made to address them. In the 1 970s several important faculty appointments were made, and the insufficiency of the European history field was partially corrected. Gerald Nash, who succeeded Frank lklé as chairman in 1974, established the History Guild, an annual meeting of history faculties In all institutions in New Mexico, private as well as public, to exchange ideas and promote interest in the discipline of history. He designed a special

MA program for the non-traditional student, to interest people in taking graduate work in history— people who otherwise would not seriously think of doing so. By setting class meetings at times which would appeal to housewives, retired people, and by establishing different admission requirements, it was hoped that the strong teaching talents of the history faculty could be put to wider use.

Honors sections in the survey courses in western civilization and United States history were established in 1976, with enrollments limited to twenty and with senior professors as well as the ablest junior faculty assigned to teach them. These made possible the study in depth of a few major problems in history by the serious and promising freshmen and sophomores.

it was in 1974 that History 100, "The Whole Works," was first offered, and 273 students from various colleges and departments in the University were enrolled. Each member of the history department offered at least two lectures on topics of his special competence and interest. Lectures on hunger, disease, technocracy, and the Holocaust were delivered, organized under the large categories of Challenge and Response: the Perennial Foes; Moral and Esthetic Man; Man's Conquest of the Material World; and Status, Change, and Cultural Conflict. Students in such diverse fields as chemical engineering and computer science were encouraged to enroll in a course where they would hear lectures on topics relevant and important to their own disciplines, and perhaps gain some insight to the claim of the historian that any branch of knowledge is enriched and elucidated by applying to It the dimension of depth which the historical perspective provides.

The fact that several professors regularly sat in on lectures in "The Whole Works" and learned more about what their colleagues were doing and what their special interests and competencies were helped to promote a collegiality which was weak in the history faculty.

Another administrative step was taken to address the problem of poor morale and estrangement between senior and junior faculty—defects noted by the Danforth visitors. In 1974 a constitution for the department of history was framed and adopted. It was hoped that this would lessen misunderstandings about how tenure and promotion decisions were made.

Some of these innovations proved useful and lasted; others flourished for a while and then were abandoned. On balance, history at the University of New Mexico gained ground in the 1970s and came closer to realizing the potential that a department with such capable instructors and gifted scholars warranted. In particular, the weakness in European history which the Danforth visitors had noted was surmounted by the employment of noted scholars in this field.

Another evaluation of the graduate programs at the University of New Mexico was made by the Graduate Committee in 1975, and it was considerably more

commendatory of history than the Spolsky Report of four years earlier. The report summarized the findings as follows:

> The Department of History offers an MA and PhD with emphasis on Latin American history and history of the southwest US including Spanish colonial and Indian. Several of the faculty have achieved national stature and are active in regional and Latin American research including editorship of four historical journals. The student/faculty ratio at the graduate level is quite low, reflecting restrictive admission procedures and restricted job opportunities for graduates. Student performance is closely supervised as the candidate progresses toward the chosen degree.
>
> The decision to concentrate graduate work in regionally relevant areas appears wise. There is no doubt that the university needs to maintain viable offerings in the major subspecialties in history. To do so requires the presence of scholars at the graduate level.
>
> Additional resources would best be utilized to further upgrade the excellence of the primary areas of concentration and to relieve some inadequacies in support staffing and library resources.

One of the most obvious strengths of the department was the breadth of its coverage. In 1976 the American Historical Association conducted an Inquiry of history departments throughout the nation to determine what fields were taught in the various colleges and universities. There were 86 fields listed, some of them geographical areas and some such topical fields as the history of science and women's history. The University of New Mexico offered instruction of 68 of the 86, plus two which were not on the AHA list. Of the other eighteen there were a few like Scandinavian history for which New Mexico has no plans. Others, including Family History, History of Medicine, and Jewish History have been added since 1976. All told, the department has come in the last twenty years to offer instruction in a breadth of fields rather remarkable in a comparatively poor state.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s there was a large turnover of faculty. Several of the professors of long standing retired: George W. Smith, Donald Cutter, William M. Dabney, Edwin Lleuwen, and Frank Iklé. The university was fortunate in finding capable, promising young men and women to replace them. There was no change in the fact that the principal areas of strength continued to be Latin America and the history of the American west and southwest. Weaknesses remained, but research contributions and publications by faculty of the various fields continued to emanate. In the early 1980s the prestige of the University of New Mexico was enhanced by the fact that three major historical journals were located in the department: the New Mexico Historical Review, edited by Richard Etulain and later Paul Hutton; The Historian, edited by Gerald Nash; and the Hispanic American Historical Review, edited by John J. Johnson.

With the decline in employment opportunities for PhDs, the department cut back on the number of graduate students accepted to work on advanced degrees, and also shaped the programs so as to provide for training in fields other than teaching, like museum work, library and archival management. Between 1969 and 1977, 54 students received doctoral degrees. Of these, 38 found positions in college teaching, two in museum direction, and three as historians for various units of the armed services.

The service character of the history department became more prominent than the training of history professionals. The staff of twenty-nine faculty carried more than 3000 enrolled students each semester, a ratio higher than that of neighboring state universities such as Arizona, Wyoming, Kansas, and Oklahoma. History, like the other humanities, had to depend on state appropriations for the support of its program, since outside grants from the government and private industries went mostly to the natural and behavioral sciences. Shifts in the budget expenditures of the various Arts and Sciences departments reflect not so much changes in priorities as the costs of maintaining laboratories and equipment for research and instruction. In 1981-82 the budget for history In the Arts and Sciences College ranked seventh, after biology, math, English, modern languages, chemistry, and physics.

For the first thirty years the history department at the University of New Mexico perceived its function as teaching, alone. The decade of the 1920s was a watershed, and since that time the research function of the historian has come to be perceived and honored as a pursuit of equal dignity, closely intertwined with and inseparable from the transmittal of knowledge.

As the University approaches its centennial it can take pride In its department of history, men and women with different specialties and competencies, differing approaches to teaching and research, not infrequently challenging one another's basic values, but all wholly committed to the proposition that the knowledge and understanding of history is absolutely indispensable to the well-being, indeed to the survival, of mankind.